MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

April 10, 2012

Members Present: Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, Mary Beth Mathews, George Meadows, Debra Schleef, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); President Richard Hurley, College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein, College of Business Dean Lynne Richardson, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Members Absent: Teresa Kennedy, Provost Jay Harper

Guests: Associate Provost John Morello, Associate Provost of Enrollment Management and Student Services Fred Pierce, SACS Compliance Certification Director Timothy O’Donnell, University Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Keith Mellinger, Distance and Blended Learning Advisory Committee Chair Steve Greenlaw, College of Education Faculty President Norah Hooper, Speaking Intensive Program Director Anand Rao, Staff Advisory Council representative Linda Falden, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:00 p.m. in the Red Room of the Woodard Campus Center.

2. Reading and Approval of Minutes. Members had received the minutes of the previous meeting of March 13, 2012 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the minutes be approved, and Suzanne Sumner seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President’s Report. President Hurley summarized his recent fundraising visits as part of a “silent campaign” to raise $50 million in five years. He estimated that approximately $12 million has been raised this year. He explained that Ian Newbould, the Interim Provost, will be arriving on April 16 and will be here for 15 months. He will focus on the SACS review, the QEP, faculty morale, and academic planning.

4. College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Report. Dean Finkelstein Reported on two new degree programs in development—the Master of Science in Geographic Information Science, which has been approved by the CAS Curriculum Committee and should be ready to go to SCHEV next year, and a proposal for a national security masters degree coming next year from the Department of Computer Science. He also noted that the Department of Political Science and International Affairs has a profitable lecture program at the Dahlgren Campus. The Athletic Director search is nearing completion, and the Fall Convocation speaker will be a philosopher.
5. College of Business Dean’s Report. Dean Richardson announced that a visiting team will be conducting the decennial review of the undergraduate business program in the next week; that the recent Executive-in-Residence program was a success, with alumni returning to discuss careers; and that a special event is being planned for faculty and area business leaders to interact.

6. College of Education Dean’s Report. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper announced that the Educator-in-Residence program scheduled for May 2, will feature Princess Moss, a Mary Washington alumna, former member of the Board of Visitors, and chair of the Executive Committee of the National Education Association. She also mentioned that the COE is in discussion with Germanna Community College to partner on development of a NSF grant proposal. She gave an update of progress on the accreditation review by the Virginia Department of Education which is continuing this summer and fall. Regarding curriculum developments, she mentioned new pathways in special education that will be proposed next year and progress in the development of a STEM major in collaboration with CAS. In response to questions, the Dean projected that the STEM major should be ready for review by the colleges in the fall and by the UFC at its February 2013 meeting, in time to be in the 2013-2014 catalog.

7. Chair’s Report. The report of the UFC chair had been submitted in writing (Attachment 2). There were no questions or comments.

8. Reports of Committees. Reports were received from the following committees: University Budget Advisory Committee (Attachments 3 and 4), University Curriculum Committee (Attachment 5), University Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 6), University Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committee (Attachments 7 and 8). Andrew Dolby asked for a motion to accept these reports, noting that proposals from the Distance and Blended Learning Committee and the Speaking Intensive Committee will be addressed separately on the agenda. The motion was made by Mary Beth Mathews, seconded by Leigh Frackelton, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

9. Revision of Section 1.9.4 of the Faculty Handbook Regarding Department Chair Appointments. Andrew Dolby explained that a minor revision was needed to the changes made on this section at the March UFC meeting (Attachment 9). Stephen Davies moved that the revision be approved. The motion was seconded by Mary Beth Mathews and approved unanimously by voice vote.

10. Revision of Appendix K of the Faculty Handbook – COE Promotion and Tenure Procedures. Jo Tyler moved that the revision of section K.5.7 regarding formation of the Tenure Appeal Advisory Committee proposed by the COE (Attachment 10) be approved. The motion was seconded by Debra Schleef. In response to a question, Jo Tyler explained that the change requested by the University Faculty Affairs Committee to include a member on the committee appointed by the Provost was included in the proposal. She explained the other substantive differences between the proposal and the parallel sections of the other colleges’ appendices. The proposal was approved unanimously by voice vote with two abstentions.

Keith Mellinger suggested that the provision in the COE’s proposal requiring that the original P&T committee’s decision and the candidate’s letter of appeal be provided to the appeal committee should be added to the other colleges’ appendices. Mary Beth Mathews made a
motion, seconded by Stephen Davies, to recommend that this change be made by the other colleges in their appendices. After discussion, Mary Beth Mathews revised the motion to recommend the University Faculty Affairs Committee review making these changes in the other colleges’ appendices. The revised motion was seconded by Leigh Frackelton and approved unanimously by voice vote.

11. Revision of Appendix F of the Faculty Handbook – CAS Rules of Order. Suzanne Sumner introduced two revisions (Attachment 11): to increase their P&T Committee membership from eight to nine, and to require that their Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee include at least two full professors. The motion to approve these revisions was made by Stephen Davies, seconded by Mary Beth Mathews, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

12. Revision of Appendix I of the Faculty Handbook – CAS Promotion and Tenure Procedures. Suzanne Sumner made a motion that the revisions of section I.6 regarding letters of recommendation proposed by the CAS Faculty Senate be approved (Attachment 12). The motion was seconded by Leigh Frackelton and approved unanimously by voice vote.

13. College of Arts and Sciences Motions. Three motions received from the CAS Faculty Senate were discussed (Attachment 13).

The first one discussed was a resolution to register CAS opposition to the decision to begin University-wide online student course evaluations. After some discussion, President Hurley agreed that there are some unanswered questions and the decision needs more thought. Follow-up discussion focused on other aspects of faculty evaluation. Keith Mellinger mentioned that the University Faculty Affairs Committee is looking at other sources of data for faculty evaluation beyond student course evaluations and FAARs. He also suggested that questions on the student course evaluation forms should be determined at the college level.

The second motion was a request to form a University-level advisory committee on libraries and other academic resources. Andrew Dolby explained that the University Faculty Organization Committee has already received a proposal for such a committee.

The third motion was a request to have the University Faculty Affairs Committee organize a forum to discuss issues relating to student-faculty collaborative research. In discussion it was explained that this would be relevant to the UFAC’s charge because of its relation to faculty evaluation and workload. President Hurley suggested that it was primarily a college-level issue and the discussions should begin at the college level. Andrew Dolby asked CAS to proceed on its own with this issue at this time.

14. Distance and Blended Learning Committee Proposal. The committee submitted a proposal for a form to be filled out for new courses to be offered in majority online format (Attachment 14). In response to a question, Tim O’Donnell explained that policies regarding online courses are needed to meet SACS and federal regulations, so there is urgency in getting these policies approved, and the course proposal form is an important piece. He also mentioned that because it is part of our 6-year plan submitted to the state, it will be under state scrutiny. Steve Greenlaw added that since we have been continuing to offer several online courses on a regular basis, we would be remiss to delay this. In discussion, one issue that was addressed was that the proposal form covers not only the course but also the instructor’s qualifications to teach online. Several mentioned the similarities between this form and forms for Speaking Intensive and Writing
Intensive course proposal forms. Another issue in discussion was whether it applied only to new courses or also to courses that have already been offered online. Andrew Dolby suggested that the Distance and Blended Learning Committee do more work to clarify the process of online course approval and have a revised course proposal form ready to be approved by the UFC early in the fall semester. Stephen Davies made a motion, seconded by Leigh Frackelton, that the general process for review of online course proposals be approved with procedural specifics and the form itself being finalized by fall, to become effective for courses offered in Spring 2013. The motion was approved by voice vote with one opposed and one abstention.

15. Speaking Intensive Committee Proposal. The committee submitted a proposal to revise the learning outcomes for speaking intensive courses (Attachment 15). Anand Rao explained that the proposal was developed in coordination with Freshman Seminar requirements and work on the First Year Experience QEP. One of the reasons for the revision was because not all speaking intensive courses have public speaking requirements, which was part of the current learning outcomes. The proposal would be in effect for the 2013-2014 Academic Catalog. Stephen Davies made the motion, seconded by Dan Hubbard, to approve the four proposed learning outcomes for speaking intensive courses. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

16. Other Business. Leigh Frackelton mentioned that the College of Business is working on revisions to its appendices, and asked if they needed to be approved by the UFC before being included in the Faculty Handbook. John Morello explained that the colleges’ appendices do not have to be approved by the UFC, but that the UFC generally wants to review the promotion and tenure policies.

John Morello asked if the faculty would have a preference about the date for Fall Convocation, and whether it could be held on the Friday before classes start. Suzanne Sumner suggested that faculty attendance would be lower than usual if the Convocation was not held on the same day as other faculty meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary
MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

March 13, 2012

Members Present: Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, Teresa Kennedy, Mary Beth Mathews, George Meadows, Debra Schleef, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Members Absent: President Richard Hurley, Provost Jay Harper, College of Business Dean Lynne Richardson

Guests: Chief of Staff Martin Wilder, Associate Provost John Morello, University Librarian Rosemary Arneson, SACS Compliance Certification Director Timothy O’Donnell, University Academic Affairs Committee Chair Nicole Crowder, University Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Keith Mellinger, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:03 p.m. in the Red Room of the Woodard Campus Center.

2. Reading and Approval of Minutes. Members had received the minutes of the previous meeting of February 7, 2012 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, and Dan Hubbard seconded. Stephen Davies suggested that the Provost’s announcement about student course evaluations being conducted online should be more prominent. He also pointed out that the pilot study has shown that the students’ written comments are not as long in the online format as in the handwritten format. The motion, with the suggested revisions, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. Reports. Due to the extensive agenda, Andrew Dolby asked that the President’s, Provost’s and Deans’ reports be kept short. There were no reports from the Provost, Deans or UFC Chair. Marty Wilder extended the President’s apologies for not being able to attend the meeting and made a couple of announcements. The Board of Visitors participated in a conference call with the Governor who asked that tuition increases be no greater than the increase in the consumer price index. He also pointed out that the recent realignment of administrative positions previously announced by email did not contain any additional administrative staff positions.

        Dean Finkelstein announced that a new Master’s degree program in Geographic Information Science has been sent to the CAS Curriculum Committee, and is on track to be ready for admissions in Fall 2014. There is also a program in development for a Master’s degree in National Security Studies. He also announced that the University is collaborating with an environmental consulting firm and other local organizations to develop a regional climate plan.
4. Committee Reports. Andrew Dolby asked for a motion to accept the submitted reports from standing committees (Attachments 2-8; no reports were received from the Grievances and Appeals, the Faculty Organization, and the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committees). Leigh Frackelton made the motion, Debra Schleef seconded, and it passed unanimously by a voice vote. Leigh Frackelton also made a motion to accept the reports submitted from the Other Advisory and Special Interest Committees (Attachments 9-13; no reports were received from the Distance and Blended Learning, First Year Seminar, Speaking Intensive, Teaching Center Advisory, and Honors Program Committees). The motion was seconded by Debra Schleef and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

5. *Faculty Handbook Section 2 Revisions*. The revisions to Section 2.3.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, and the addition of the Honors Program Advisory Committee that the UFC had recommended at the February meeting had been forwarded to the Colleges for approval. Suzanne Sumner reported that they were approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, and Leigh Frackelton reported that they were approved by the College of Business. Jo Tyler reported that all revisions, except the proposal in Section 2.3.4.2 to extend the term of office of UFC members from two to three years, were approved by the College of Education.

In discussing the additional revisions to Section 2 of the *Handbook* that had been discussed at the February UFC meeting, Andrew Dolby reported that the Acting CIO Justin Webb had requested that the CIO be added as an *ex-officio* member of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee. Jo Tyler also pointed out that in the duties of the First Year Seminar, Speaking Intensive, and Writing Intensive Committees, the option for the chair to add to the committees’ duties should be deleted, since we have proposed that these committees become faculty advisory committees instead of administrative advisory committees.

In further discussion of the motion, Rosemary Arneson pointed out that the effect of doing away with the University Academic Resources Committee means that there is no committee that specifically gives the faculty a role in advising the UMW Libraries director. She recommended the creation of a Library Advisory Committee as a faculty committee (Attachment 14) and explained that as Director she feels that the faculty would provide better input than an administrative committee of members appointed by the Director. Andrew Dolby suggested that we include this recommendation as new business at a future UFC meeting. Megan Holbrook expressed support for the inclusion of a student as an *ex-officio* member of the proposed committee, and Mary Gendernalik-Cooper suggested that a graduate student also be included.

Jo Tyler made the motion to approve the changes in Section 2 of the *Handbook*, with the addition of the CIO as an *ex-officio* member of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee and with the deletion of the possibility for chairs of advisory committees to add to the duties of their committees. The motion was seconded by Debra Schleef and approved unanimously by a voice vote. The final version of the changes in Section 2 (Attachment 15) was forwarded to the Provost’s office for incorporation into the *Handbook*.

6. *Academic Affairs Motions*. Nicole Crowder, Chair of the University Academic Affairs Committee, introduced three motions relating to 1) course equivalencies for Cambridge A-level exams, 2) requirements for students enrolling in internship courses, and 3) the co-enrollment agreement with Germanna Community College (Attachment 16). She explained that the chart accompanying their motion about Cambridge A-level course equivalencies does not include
foreign languages, but they are part of the UAAC motion. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the UAAC’s motion on Cambridge A-levels be approved, Leigh Frackelton seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

In discussion of the internship motion, Jo Tyler asked if the requirement that students have a GPA of 2.0 for enrollment in an internship course would prohibit a college or department from requiring a higher GPA. Nicole Crowder explained that this is already covered in other parts of the policy that are not being changed by this motion. However, there was general agreement that the GPA requirement be worded as “a minimum UMW GPA of 2.0”. John Morello pointed out the importance of precisely wording what departments can do and suggested that the policy should be included in the Dictionary of Academic Regulations, and asked for wording as soon as possible. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper pointed out that if departments can set a higher GPA, then it should also appear in the departments’ policies. Stephen Davies made a motion to remove the 58 credit hour prerequisite for enrollment in internship courses, while retaining the requirement for 12 credits earned at UMW. This motion was seconded by Mary Beth Mathews and approved unanimously by a voice vote. Andrew Dolby suggested that the rest of the motion be returned to the UAAC for clarification of wording about the GPA requirement and suggestions for how and where the policy would be published.

In discussion of the motion on the co-enrollment agreement with Germanna Community College (Attachment 17), John Morello explained that it is long overdue and that we will probably make a similar agreement with Northern Virginia Community College next. In response to a question about what impact these co-enrollment agreements would have on course enrollment numbers, he explained that it would be self-limiting, since the community college students would be enrolled as non-degree students after the early registration period for degree students ends. He added that the overall impact on enrollments will not be known until the agreement has been in place for a while. The agreement is expected to be finalized in the Fall 2012, allowing course enrollments by Germanna students in Spring 2013. Stephen Davies moved that the motion be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and it was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

7. Faculty Handbook Section 1.9 Revisions. A proposal for revising the section of the Handbook dealing with the role, evaluation, and replacement of department chairs was prepared by the Provost’s office with input from Deans and Department Chairs (Attachment 18). Leigh Frackelton made a motion for approval of these revisions, which was seconded by Dan Hubbard. Leigh Frackelton opened the discussion saying that he disagrees with the proposed procedure for replacing a department chair (section 1.9.4). He pointed out that the proposal prevents the faculty from having a say in the removal decision, yet chairs are originally appointed through a process that begins with nomination by the faculty. John Morello explained that until now there has been no policy for how to remove a chair for poor performance. There was a good deal of discussion comparing the process for selecting chairs, which was unchanged in the proposal, with the proposed process for removal. Several faculty suggested that the faculty should be involved in both processes. An additional point made was that the chair often acts as an intermediary between faculty and the dean, so it would not be in the interests of the faculty for the dean alone to initiate the termination process. It was also pointed out that in the rationale accompanying the proposal, reference is made to “the department chair’s performance” as the reason for removal, yet the proposed wording in the subsection about termination (1.9.4.4) did not mention “performance” or any other grounds upon which removal can take place. Another point made
was that a department chair who goes on sabbatical should have the option to continue as chair, yet this option was not included in the proposal.

During the discussion, John Morello adapted these concerns to handbook language for further revisions of section 1.9.4 while projecting them on the screen. Eventually, he had wording that found general consensus among UFC members. Leigh Frackelton amended his motion to incorporate the newly crafted wording for section 1.9.4 (Attachment 19), which was seconded by Debra Schleef and approved unanimously by voice vote.

8. Faculty Handbook Section 7 Revisions. The University Faculty Affairs Committee submitted a proposal to add procedures to the Handbook for appealing decisions of the college Promotion and Tenure Committees (Attachment 6). Procedures for such appeals are currently part of the Colleges’ Promotion and Tenure Appendices. The UFAC’s rationale for the proposal pointed out that the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business have the same procedure for appeals, while the College of Education’s tenure appeal process is different. The UFAC’s goal in making the proposal was to ensure that all colleges have the same appeal procedure. Jo Tyler moved that the proposal be tabled to allow more time to consider the broader implications that the proposal may have for college autonomy and to explore ideas for how University-level committees should exercise oversight.

Discussion of the UFAC proposal began with ideas from the three colleges for other changes they have considered in their promotion and tenure appendices. Keith Mellinger, Chair of the UFAC, suggested that these could be included in the appendices. Suzanne Sumner asked whether a proposal from a university level committee that changes the appendices of a college should be approved by the colleges before coming to the UFC. George Meadows mentioned that the newer, smaller colleges may need to have more flexible procedures, and suggested that the University-level policy should establish guidelines within which the colleges would develop their different specific procedures. Andrew Dolby pointed out that in its details the proposal contains changes that affect all three colleges’ policies. Several members expressed ideas about how to involve the colleges in approval of university-level proposals that impact the colleges’ policies.

In response to a question about whether the College of Education feels the proposal is unfair to them, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper explained that, regardless of the specifics of the proposal, the concern in the COE is with the process in which the proposal was developed without input from the college as a whole. She pointed out that the COE appendix was thoroughly reviewed last year by the special Oversight Committee and by the UFC to make sure it was parallel to policies of the other colleges. She added that the UFAC’s rationale implies that there was something unfair about the COE’s appeal process, but there has been no claim from any of the candidates that they were treated unfairly.

Mary Beth Mathews seconded the motion to table the discussion of the UFAC proposal and called the question. The motion to table failed on a voice vote.

Discussion continued with a focus on section 7.8.11 of the proposal about the procedure for appointing the tenure appeals committees. Currently the tenure appeals committee in the College of Education is appointed by the dean with one member selected by the candidate, while in the other colleges the dean, the Provost, and the college Faculty Affairs Committee, as well as the candidate, appoint members. There was general consensus that in order to ensure fairness to candidates making appeals, the appeals committees in all three colleges should consist of members appointed by a variety of participants in the appeals process, and not have a majority of
members appointed by the dean alone. It was pointed out that a claim of unfairness could result if the committee, which submits its recommendation to the dean, has a majority of members appointed by the dean.

Further discussion addressed the next steps needed in order for the COE appeal committees to be appointed in the same manner as exists in the other colleges. Terry Kennedy expressed a concern about having a vote on a proposal that affects only the COE but is not supported by the COE representatives on the UFC. Leigh Frackelton agreed that we need to give the COE a chance to make the changes we recommend. He made a motion to table discussion of the UFAC proposal and ask the COE to change its appeal committee to make it consistent with that of other colleges. John Morello explained that if language is changed in the appendices, rather than in Section 7, it does not have to be approved by the Board of Visitors, allowing more time for the colleges to review and revise their appendices. Stephen Davies seconded the motion, stating that the issue of appeals committee membership is small compared to the bigger issue of respect among the colleges. Andrew Dolby summarized the motion stating that we will ask the COE for revised wording of their appendix to make it consistent with the sections of the other colleges’ appendices dealing with appeals committees, and we will vote on the COE language at our next meeting before considering the proposal from the UFAC. The motion was approved by a voice vote. Andrew Dolby subsequently sent COE Faculty President Norah Hooper an email containing this request (Attachment 20).

9. Proposal for Guidelines for Submitting Course and Curriculum Proposals. The University Curriculum Committee had submitted a draft of guidelines and procedures to be followed when proposing changes in courses or programs (Attachment 21). Jo Tyler pointed out that changes to certificate programs are listed in the section on proposals requiring approval by SCHEV and also in the section on proposals not requiring approval by SCHEV. John Morello said that this inconsistency will be corrected. Further discussion focused on the issue of shared governance between administration and faculty in the area of curriculum decisions. Leigh Frackelton suggested that we need more collaboration rather than parallel processes. UCC Chair Mary Beth Mathews explained that both the college and university curriculum committees include administrators and that this proposal doesn’t change that. John Morello pointed out that the proposal emphasizes consultation between faculty and administrators, particularly in relation to program changes. He added that all changes will still be initiated by faculty, and when deans or other administrators reject changes they must provide their justification in writing. Jo Tyler asked about the provision to post the justifications on the UCC’s website. Mary Beth Mathews stated that making them public would help in drafting subsequent curriculum proposals. Richard Finkelstein stated that it does, however, make the process more cumbersome. Terry Kennedy made a motion to approve the proposed guidelines with the correction about certificate programs but without requiring justification for rejection of proposals to be posted online. She recommended that we deal with the broader issue of “sunshine” later. Leigh Frackelton seconded the motion, and it was approved by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, UFC Secretary
To: The University of Mary Washington Board of Visitors’ Academic Affairs Committee

From: Andrew Dolby, University Faculty Council Chair

Date: April 4, 2012

RE: University Faculty Council Chair’s report

The University Faculty Council has finalized some key changes to Sections 1.9 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook. An important objective of the UFC this year has been to evaluate and improve the overall faculty governance structure that it developed during the previous academic year. Therefore, Section 2, which deals with faculty governance, was our primary focus. The UFC carefully examined the flow of business through each level of governance and reconsidered both the function and composition of each committee with the aim of increasing their effectiveness and efficiency. This process included extensive deliberation during our regular meetings, a special work session held in November, and a small-group meeting between me, Jo Tyler, and Associate Provost John Morello held in January. Committees (e.g. the University Faculty Organization Committee) initiated some changes and forwarded them as motions to the UFC for approval. These revisions, enumerated in the Provost’s report, were thoroughly reviewed by the faculty governing bodies of each college and were made available for comment to the full university faculty. The UFC now submits them on behalf of the faculty to the Board of Visitors for action.

The Provost’s Office initiated the revisions to Section 1.9 (details provided in the Provost’s report). These changes are significant for the faculty because they clarify department chairs’ roles, ensure continuity if chairs’ terms are interrupted or curtailed, and protect chairs’ rights if the termination process is initiated. Again, they were reviewed at all levels of faculty governance and fully considered by the chairs. The UFC considers them ready for action by the Board of Visitors.

In addition to Faculty Handbook revisions, the UFC approved several motions submitted by university committees. We approved motions by the University Academic Affair Committee to establish Cambridge Level-A Examinations discipline-specific transfer credit standards and to accept a co-enrollment agreement with Germanna Community College. We also approved a new protocol submitted by the University Curriculum Committee for processing curriculum changes. This document details specific approval procedures for different types of curriculum changes (including new forms for each type of change) and gives the college Deans and Provost more direct roles in the approval process. Additionally, it prescribes a plan to allow departments to submit proposals electronically.

On March 31, I attended the Faculty Senate of Virginia (FSV) meeting held at Christopher Newport University. Suzanne Sumner also attended the meeting. Other represented institutions included (but were not limited to) Virginia State, Radford, Norfolk State, and Longwood Universities. Highlights of the meeting’s content are: 1) comparative discussion of faculty involvement in budget planning and institutional grievance, appeals, and dismissal procedures, 2)
legislation before the Virginia General Assembly during its most recent session, and 3) higher education initiatives on SCHEV’s current agenda.
Budget Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2012
Trinkle 243

In Attendance: Tim O’Donnell, Rick Pearce, Paul Messplay, Raul Chavez Negrete, Joe Romero, Dana Hall, Milton Kline, Jay Harper, John Morello, Tamie Pratt-Fartro

I. Approval of Minutes from 2-6-12
II. Discussion of BAC Role
   a. Tim suggested that perhaps this committee did not have enough expertise and knowledge in specific areas to make budget reduction recommendations
   b. Rick clarified our role as making suggestions to President Hurley based on our institutional knowledge
   c. Milton brought his perspective from SAC stating that many staff had reached their limits regarding budget cuts
   d. Discussion regarding opening up a web-based call to the institution to make suggestions regarding budget reductions
   e. Raul suggested creating a Canvas site to allow all staff and faculty to contribute suggestions for both budget reductions and revenue generating ideas
   f. Raul presented a visual to better understand contributing factors of the current budget deficit, as well as information needed by BAC to inform a broader understanding of the future fiscal needs and/or shortfalls
   g. Rick suggested that we consider short and long-term revenue generating ideas as well as addressing the immediate charge to make suggestions to the President
   h. John clarified that BAC is a faculty committee that is directed by and reports to the UFC; BAC is not an administrative committee

III. John brought information regarding sabbaticals to inform budget understanding and to answer specific questions posed to Joe from a faculty member

IV. Rick presented an overview of the primary budget categories:
   a. Education and General: state funds, operation and maintenance, academics
   b. Auxiliary Services: Room & Board, bookstore, athletics, infrastructure, no state funds to support this strand of the budget
   c. Comprehensive Fee: fee charged to students to cover the following: faculty research, clubs, student organizations, faculty development

V. Tim suggested Richard Dickeson text: Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services as a book that might inform BAC’s work

VI. Next Meeting: 2-27-12 in Trinkle 243: 8:00am
   a. Planned overview of 2011-2012 budget: how the budget is put together and how the instructional budget, in particular, is calculated
Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
March 12, 2012

In Attendance: Tim O’Donnell, Paul Messplay, Rick Pearce, Raul Chavez Negrete, Joe Romero, Nabil Al-Tikriti, Milton Kline, Danny Tweedy, Tamie Pratt-Fartro

I. Minutes from 2-13-12 will be distributed electronically by Joe

II. BAC Charge and Current Budget Discussion
   a. Joe discussed his and Andrew Dolby’s conversation with President Hurley regarding BAC’s charge; President Hurley has withdrawn his charge, preferring instead that the committee review the whole budget, which is likely to include cuts, before he submits it to the board
   b. Rick and Paul putting final budget together and will bring to BAC although the General Assembly is not meeting again until March 21st; GA’s decisions will impact the amount of shortfall we will need to make-up
   c. Raul discussed the need of each college to explore revenue generating ideas
   d. Paul reminded the committee that budget issue variables include final actions of the General Assembly, particularly with regard to potential employee bonuses and/or permanent salary increases, and a continuing decline in out-of-state students

III. Review of 2011-2012 budget documents:
   a. Paul reviewed the PP overview of Operating Budget of 2011-2012 budget; was asked by committee to generate a chart with Total Costs, Revenue and State Funding for the past 5 years for comparison and discussion at next meeting
   b. Rick discussed the role of the UMW Foundation: manages endowment and real estate; they do not do any fundraising; all fundraising done internally
   c. Nabil expressed interest in comparing UMW endowment to other COPLAC institutions; Rick will gather that data for the committee
   d. Paul reviewed FY 11-12 Summary of the Operating Budget and Operating Revenue Budget

IV. Next Meeting:
   a. No meeting date until we receive more information regarding GA and governor’s decisions on the 2012-2013 state budget
Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee
University of Mary Washington
14 March 2012

Present: Voting members:
- Gail Brooks (Accounting and Management Information Systems) – College of Business
- Beverly Epps (Foundation, Leadership, and Special Populations) – College of Education
- Mary Beth Mathews (Classics, Philosophy, and Religion), chair – University Faculty Council
- Gary Richards (English, Linguistics, and Communication), secretary – College of Arts and Sciences

Non-voting members:
- Rita Dunston – Registrar
- John Morello – Associate Provost

Chair Mary Beth Mathews called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. in Trinkle 243.

Minutes of the 22 February meeting have been circulated and approved electronically, and secretary Gary Richards had filed them with UFC. These are posted at http://ufc.umw.edu/committees/university-curriculum-committee/.

Mary Beth Mathews reported that a revised draft of “Guidelines for Submitting Course and Curriculum Proposals to the University Curriculum Committee at the University of Mary Washington” was approved by the UFC.

New business:

From the College of Arts and Sciences:
- The Committee approved a proposal for the new course HIST 432: Ottoman Legacies.
- The Committee approved a proposal for the new course ARTS 381: Special Topics in Studio Art.
- The Committee approved proposals to revise the Theatre Major and the Theatre Program. These included a proposal to change the title and catalog copy of THEA 131, 132: Stagecraft to Technical Production; a proposal to change the title and catalog copy of THEA 291: Fabric Dyeing & Painting to Fabric Modification; a proposal to change the title and catalog copy of THEA 361, 362: History of the Theatre to Theatre History & Literature; and proposals to change the prerequisites and catalog copy to THEA 321: Acting, THEA 433: Lighting Design, THEA 434: Scene Design, and THEA 436: Costume Design.
- The Committee approved a proposal to revise the Musical Theatre Minor.
- The Committee approved a proposal to revise the Studio Art Major by changing the prerequisite and catalog copy of ARTS 120: Drawing I.

All of these were approved to go into effect Fall 2013.
From the College of Business:

• The Committee approved a proposal formalizing course substitutions in the BPS program.
• The Committee approved a proposal to change the prerequisites and catalog copy of BUAD 350: Business Communication to “Prerequisites: Business Administration 152, 259, junior or senior status; and Business Administration major or permission of department chair.”
• The Committee approved a proposal to change the prerequisites and catalog copy of BUAD 464: Business Ethics to “Prerequisites: junior or senior status; and Business Administration major or permission of department chair.”
• The Committee approved a proposal for the new course BUAD 456: Entrepreneurial Venture Creation.

These were approved to go into effect Fall 2013 with the exception of the course substitutions, which were approved for Fall 2012.

The Committee discussed special majors, endorsed an articulation that procedures handling these should be standardized across campus, and charged Mary Beth Mathews to prepare this for presentation at the UFC.

John Morello reported that the “Guidelines for Submitting Course and Curriculum Proposals to the University Curriculum Committee at the University of Mary Washington” approved by the UFC needs reformatting and slight revisions; however, there is the possibility that the website will be functioning by fall 2012 and curricular matters will be handled through those channels. In part because of this, the persons elected to serve as chairs of the College curriculum committees are invited to attend the 18 April meeting of the UCC.

The meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Richards
Report from the University Faculty Affairs Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
March 14, 2012

Present:
Venitta McCall (Foundation, Leadership and Special Populations) – College of Education
Leslie Martin (Sociology and Anthropology) – College of Arts and Sciences
Keith Mellinger (Mathematics) – College of Arts and Sciences
Patricia Orozco (Modern Foreign Languages) – College of Arts and Sciences
Larry Penwell (Management and Marketing) – College of Business
Alan Griffith (Biology) – College of Arts and Sciences

The meeting came to order at 3:30pm in Trinkle 138.

Keith attended the meeting on March 13\textsuperscript{th} where the UFC has begun discussing the UFAC’s suggested revisions to university policies on tenure and promotion processes. He reported that the UFC will continue discussing proposed changes to the University Faculty Handbook at their April meeting. Keith will attend that meeting as well.

Much of the meeting was spent discussing the charge to comprehensively review the current course evaluation instrument and the role of this instrument in the current annual faculty evaluation process. Work on this will continue at the next UFAC meeting, but we acknowledged that it is not likely that we will have a proposal ready for the UFC this academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Martin, secretary
MINUTES

Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee
Meeting of 24 February, 2012
Chair: Chris Foss
Secretary: JeanAnn Dabb
Members present: Dawn Bowen, Teresa Coffman, JeanAnn Dabb, Chris Foss, Bob Greene, and John Morello (ex-officio)

The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. in Combs 322.

The Committee addressed the charge from UFC to create a new faculty award. Discussion began as committee members reported on COPLAC schools, and others, which have faculty awards recognizing scholarly and professional work. Reports from this research were shared via email before the meeting. The ex officio member also investigated examples of research awards at other schools (not in COPLAC) and shared the ideas with the committee via email. As discussion developed, topics such as aspects of eligibility, award criteria, and description of procedures were considered.

A draft version of the award description was generated and it will circulate among Committee members for approval in the next two weeks. Following approval of the draft proposal, a meeting with staff in the Office of Advancement will be scheduled when the financial dimension of such an award can be considered.

Committee members will communicate via email as the draft of the award proposal is refined in preparation for our next meeting and then a final report will be sent to UFC prior to their April 10 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55
MINUTES

Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee
Meeting of 19 March, 2012
Chair: Chris Foss
Secretary: JeanAnn Dabb
Members present: Dawn Bowen, Teresa Coffman, JeanAnn Dabb, Chris Foss, Bob Greene, and John Morello (ex-officio)

The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. in Combs 348.

Minutes from the meeting of 24 February were approved.

After having previously received electronic copies of nomination letters for the various faculty awards via email, the committee members began deliberation on the individual awards. The committee members shared opinions and discussed features of the nomination materials as each award was addressed. Votes were conducted at the conclusion of discussion and the results are to be conveyed to the Provost in preparation for announcement of the awards at May graduation or the initial faculty meeting of the 2012-2013 academic year (Topher Bill Award).

The meeting adjourned at 5:15
1.9.4 Continuity and/or Termination of Department Chair Appointments

.1 In the event that a department chair is approved for a sabbatical or other planned leave during his or her term as chair, and the chair elects to step down as chair during the term of the sabbatical or other planned leave, a temporary department chair may be appointed. The temporary chair should meet the qualifications required for serving as a department chair. The department chair nominates the temporary chair replacement. The College Dean will request that the department nominate a person to serve as acting chair until the sabbatical or leave concludes, subject to the approval of the College Dean, the Provost, and the President. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.2 In the event of an emergency leave of absence or a sick leave that would interfere with the chair being able to exercise his or her expected duties, the College Dean will request that the department nominate a person to serve as acting chair until the chair is able to return to duty. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.3 A department chair may resign the appointment at any time during its duration, subject to the acceptance of the College Dean and the Provost.

.4 In the unusual event that a department chair’s performance requires that he/she be replaced before the term has expired, a department chair’s appointment may be terminated. Termination procedures may be initiated either by the faculty of the department or by the College Dean at any time during the chair’s term. Termination is subject to the approval of both the College Dean, the Provost and the President. The reasons for the Dean’s recommendation to terminate the chair’s appointment must be presented in writing to the chair. A chair wishing to contest the Dean’s recommendation may write a letter of exception to the Provost. The letter of exception is due one week after the date of the Dean's written recommendation that the chair's appointment be terminated. After reviewing the Dean’s recommendation and the letter of exception (if any), the Provost will, within one week after receipt of the letter of exception, render a decision on the Dean's recommendation and will present that decision in writing with copies to the department chair and the Dean. If the Provost disagrees with the Dean’s recommendation, the review process stops. Should the Provost agree with the Dean’s recommendation, the chair may write a letter of exception to the Provost's decision. The letter of exception to the Provost's decision is due to the President one week after the date of the Provost’s written recommendation supporting the Dean’s recommendation that the chair's appointment be terminated. Before making a final determination about ending a department chair’s appointment as chair, the President will review the recommendations from the Dean and the Provost and all letters of exception from the chair before rendering a decision. The President’s decision, which is final, must be presented in writing with copies to the department chair, the Dean, and the Provost.
The Revision below was unanimously passed by the College of Education Faculty:

Revision to COE Promotion and Tenure Appendix, Section K.5.7:

Wording in black is copied from the current COE tenure procedures
Wording in blue is copied from the CAS tenure procedures (sections I.4.11-I.4.12)
Wording in red is recommended revisions the COE is including. Some of these differences,
such as the need for a contingency plan if there is no member of FAC eligible for the TAAC,
are necessary because of the small size of the COE faculty.

K.5. STEPS IN THE TENURE REVIEW PROCESS
K.5.7 Appeal of Committee Decision.
No later than January 17, faculty members requesting tenure may appeal the recommendations
of the P&T Committee by submitting a request for reconsideration and justification for such
reconsideration on the basis of procedural or substantive grounds to the Dean. The Dean shall
appoint a committee to review the appeal which shall include one member selected by the
candidate. In each instance when an appeal is requested, the dean shall, within one working week,
establish a Tenure Appeal Advisory Committee (TAAC), which shall be composed of one member of
the COE Faculty Affairs Committee selected by the committee, one member appointed by the dean,
one member appointed by the Provost, and one member appointed by the appellant. No person on
the TAAC should be a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that rendered the tenure
recommendation being appealed. No person on the TAAC, other than the person selected by the
appellant, should be a faculty member who has written a letter of recommendation for the
candidate’s tenure file. All members serving on the TAAC shall be tenured. If there is no member of
the COE Faculty Affairs Committee eligible to serve on the TAAC, then the COE Faculty Affairs
Committee appoints a replacement member of the TAAC from among the eligible members of the
COE faculty. In the event of multiple appeals, the three members appointed respectively by the
Faculty Affairs Committee, the dean, and the Provost shall serve on each appeal committee; the
member selected by the appellant shall serve only on the committee reviewing the appeal of his or
her selector. The TAAC, with access to all information about the candidate and the tenure criteria
available to the original P&T Committee as well as the original Committee’s recommendation and
the candidate’s letter of appeal, shall reconsider the recommendations of the original committee.
The TAAC shall make its recommendation in writing to the dean within four working weeks. The
dean shall inform the appellant of the TAAC’s recommendation within two working days.
Motion to the University Faculty Council: Resolved, to revise the following language to Appendix F.9.3 in the Faculty Handbook (4/10/12)

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (CAS Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee)

Change From:

“There must be at least one Full Professor and one tenured individual among the non ex officio members of this committee.”

Change to:

“There must be at least two Full Professors and one tenured individual among the non ex officio members of this committee.”

Rationale:

All faculty members serving on a CAS Promotion Appeal Advisory Committee (PAAC) are required to be full professors. One member of the PAAC is a representative from the CAS Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee (FAAC). In the last few years only one non ex officio member of the FAAC has been eligible to serve on promotion appeals committees.

Thus, to avoid overburdening a single faculty member, FAAC recommends that the CAS Faculty Organization Committee ensure that the membership of the CAS FAAC contain at least two full professors when elections are held.

Motion to the University Faculty Council: Resolved, to revise Appendix F of the University Faculty Handbook to change the committee membership from eight to nine. (4/10/12)

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee)

Whereas, the addition of an eighth member of the Promotion and Tenure committee this year the committee has left the committee with an even number of members. Whereas, the committee is required to make a recommendation on all files submitted to it. Whereas, there is no procedure in place for how tie votes would translate into recommendations. Whereas, an odd number of committee members would solve the problem.
Resolved, that Appendix F should be revised as follows:

**F.9.6 Promotion and Tenure Committee**  The committee consists of *nine eight* faculty members, *eight seven from the College of Arts and Sciences and one faculty member external to CAS*, all to be elected by the CAS faculty. All members must have attained the rank of associate professor or above with tenure, and at least four members whom shall have attained the rank of full professor, by the date of election. Members serve staggered three-year terms, with three persons elected each year, *except every second and third year, when two persons shall be elected*. The committee elects a chair from its membership. Members are nominated and elected according to the rules spelled out in §F.7.2 and §F.7.2.5 of this *Handbook*. The committee’s duties are to:
Motion to the University Faculty Council: Resolved, to revise Appendix I of the University Faculty Handbook to clarify the expectations for the constituents in the promotion and tenure process. (4/10/12)

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee)

Whereas, the Promotion and Tenure Committee finds that many letters in promotion and tenure files written by department colleagues, institutional colleagues, and colleagues in the discipline do not assess the candidates relative to the criteria outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Whereas, such letters do not help the Committee assess whether a candidate has met the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Whereas, there is considerable variation in the roles department chairs play in the solicitation of letters for promotion and tenure files. Whereas, it is a widely established standard in Higher Education for the chair to solicit such letters and to ensure that letter writers have access to the relevant criteria for tenure and promotion. Whereas clarifying the roles of departmental colleagues, department chairs, and institutional colleagues would make the process more consistent for candidates across the college.

Resolved that Appendix I should be revised as follows:

I.6 EXPECTATIONS FOR THE CONSTITUENTS IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

.1 Departmental Colleagues Departmental colleagues should write letters that assess the candidate’s performance as measured against the relevant criteria for tenure and/or promotion in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service. Such letters should explain the candidate’s role in the department in terms of both teaching and service. In addition, the departmental colleagues’ letters should help to explain the significance of the candidate’s professional activity. Recommendations should be based on specific information.

.2 Department Chair The department chair assumes two roles in the tenure and promotion process. First, the chair should solicit the required letters from departmental colleagues and invite institutional colleagues and colleagues in the discipline, as identified by the candidate, to submit letters for the file. The chair will advise all persons writing letters of the deadlines and of the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Second, the chair’s letter assessing the candidate should draw on these letters and the chair’s own review of the candidate’s performance over time to explain the candidate’s role in the department. Specifically, the chair should take extra care to explain the department’s style of operation, so that the candidate’s important roles can be more adequately understood. The chair’s letter should also explain the significance and quality of the candidate’s professional activity. The chair’s letter should then give an honest summative evaluation of the candidate’s work in all three areas. The committee asks for the chair’s best, most careful judgment of the candidate’s work over an extended time. That judgment should be based on specific information reported in the letter and (usually) reflected in the series of evaluations that the file contains. Finally, the committee assumes that the chair has verified the accuracy of all substantive claims on the candidate’s curriculum vitae.

.3 Institutional Colleagues Institutional colleagues should explain the specific contexts in which they have worked with the candidate and evaluate her/his performance in those areas as
measured against the relevant criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Recommendations should be based on specific information that is reported in the letter.

.4 Colleagues in the Discipline Candidates should see that these references address the context in which the candidate’s work has become known and the standing of the candidate’s work within the discipline or the profession.
Motion to the University Faculty Council:

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (4/10/12)

To ask the CAS Representative to the UFC (Suzanne Sumner) to recommend that the UFC create a faculty committee, reporting to the UFC, that will advise the library and other academic resources.

Motion to the University Faculty Council:

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (4/10/12)

Resolved, to register the CAS Faculty Senate’s opposition to the immediate transition to online course evaluations, to recommend to the Provost’s office to delay implementation pursuant to further review, and we return the matter to the University Faculty Affairs Committee for further study.

Whereas, the data collected in the pilot failed to generate an acceptable student response rate in the online course evaluation as presented in the pilot. Whereas, while we understand the need to save money in the current budget climate, course evaluations are not an area in which sacrifices can be made with reasonable results, in large part due to the significant role evaluations play in the promotion and tenure decisions.

Motion to the University Faculty Council:

Submitted by: CAS Faculty Senate (4/10/12)

To direct the University Faculty Affairs Committee to host a joint Town Hall forum with the Student Government Association on Student-Faculty Collaborative Research in the 2012-2013 academic year. The purpose of the forum is to discuss and to educate the university community about the nature and value of student research in different disciplines and to inform the work of the faculty committees dealing with awards, fellowships, grants, merit pay, promotion and tenure, and sabbaticals.
To: Faculty Senate

From: Anand Rao, SI Program Director

Re: SI Committee Proposal for SI Learning Outcomes

In response to a University-wide call to identify Learning Outcomes for all courses, the SI Committee developed a series of LOs that was based upon the goals and objectives of the SI Program (see “Attachment A: Speaking Intensive Program Learning Outcomes” below). However, it was apparent that the list was unwieldy and it was unrealistic for any SI course to support all of these Learning Outcomes. The Committee worked to review those Learning Outcomes to find a set that should be met in every SI course. The result is the proposal that is attached. These Learning Outcomes will replace those in Attachment A.

This proposal makes a minor change to the current SI graduation requirement. While students are still required to take 2 SI courses, at least one of those SI courses must be designated as SI+, meaning that it includes an individual presentation. This change would go into effect in the next catalog.

Here are answers to some FAQs about the proposal:

Will current SI courses have to be reviewed by the SI Committee?

No- all current SI courses will retain the SI designation without review.

What if current SI courses do not already include the items listed under the required LOs for SI designated courses?

We feel that the Learning Outcomes for SI courses are limited and reasonable in scope- they are very much in line with both the original goals of the SI Program, and with how SI courses are being taught. Many SI courses already include all of these elements. If there is a LO that is not currently supported by an SI course, then we ask the instructor to include that element in their course. We are, of course, happy to work with any faculty member to help support their course, and can provide materials to help them develop any aspect of their course.

What is meant by ‘students will be able to metacommunicate’ – how can an SI course support this?

This means to talk about how one communicates. We are looking for students to have a chance to reflect on their communication patterns, and this can be done with most any SI assignment that is already in use. Most SI courses already satisfy this LO through self- and peer-evaluation. For those courses that do not
already include a self- and peer-assessment component, they can do so easily by adding this to an existing assignment. We have plenty of sample assignments and evaluation forms to choose from.

**How will SI+ courses be designated?**

An SI+ course is simply an SI course that includes an individual presentation. There are many current SI courses that meet this requirement. Once the proposal is approved, Anand will contact each SI instructor to ask if they include an individual presentation in their SI course. If they do, then their course can carry the SI+ designation. If not, then their course will retain the SI designation. New course proposals will be asked the same question, and will be designated appropriately. Since this change to the SI requirement will not take effect until the next catalog, we have plenty of time for the designations to be made.

**Will the Learning Outcomes in the FSEM be required of all FSEM courses?**

The Learning Outcomes for the FSEM that are included in this proposal are taken from the QEP proposal, which includes LOs that will be required of all FSEM courses. The QEP also includes reference to new resources that will be available to support these, and other, FSEM requirements.
Speaking Intensive Program Learning Outcomes Proposal
Spring 2012

The Learning Outcomes (LOs) for the SI Program will be satisfied through three student experiences: the FSEM, one SI+ course, and one SI or SI+ course.

Speaking Intensive Learning Outcomes found in the FSEM:
The following Learning Outcomes are embedded in the FSEM as part of the QEP:

- Students will be able to implement elements of the communication process, drawing on basic theories and principles of oral communication.
- Students will critically evaluate mediated and face-to-face communication.
- Students will communicate effectively in a variety of settings, including public speaking and group discussion.
- Students will utilize a variety of research techniques to retrieve information efficiently, evaluate retrieved information and synthesize information effectively to support their messages/arguments.

Rationale: the FSEM has long been recognized as a vital part of the SI experience for all students. The QEP builds upon this tradition and outlines the Learning Outcomes above, among others, as important for the development of UMW students’ communication skills. These LOs are listed in the March 19, 2012 QEP draft at the beginning of Chapter 3: Student Learning Outcomes (page 13).

Learning Outcomes for SI Designated Courses
Courses designated as SI will be placed in two categories: those that include an individual presentation (designated SI+), and those that do not (designated SI). All courses currently designated as SI will retain that designation. The SI+ designation can be added to any SI course. While the graduation requirement of completing two SI courses will remain the same, at least one of the required SI courses must be an SI+ course (meaning that it includes an individual presentation).

The following Learning Outcomes will apply to all Speaking Intensive courses:

- Students will understand and be able to explain the conventions and expectations of oral communication as practiced within the discipline of the course taken.
- Students will apply theories and strategies for crafting messages (verbal, nonverbal, and visual) for particular audiences and purposes.
- Students will be able to craft oral messages after a conscious process in which various options are reviewed and will be able to explain and support their choices.
• Students will be able to metacommunicate about their own communication patterns.

Speaking Intensive courses that require an individual presentation (SI+ courses) will also include the following Learning Outcome:

• Students will plan, research, organize, support, and deliver ideas and arguments in a public speaking setting.

Rationale: the Learning Outcomes for the SI program, as drawn from the approved goals and objectives, were not only unwieldy in their number, but were also too expansive and unrealistic for most any SI course to encompass. This proposal is an attempt, on the part of the SI Committee and the SI Program, to simplify and focus on the communication elements that we feel the faculty would expect to find in any SI course.
Attachment A: Current Speaking Intensive Program

Learning Outcomes

Students satisfy the Speaking Intensive (SI) requirement through successful completion of two Speaking Intensive courses. SI courses are found across the University and at every level, though more are found at the upper-level in many programs. SI courses are not the only opportunities for students to develop their oral communication skills as many courses that are not designated as Speaking Intensive include SI-related components. The Speaking Center is available for use by all students, and is often used to support and supplement work done in SI and non-SI courses. Through the satisfaction of the SI requirement, students are expected to meet the following learning outcomes.

Learning Outcomes

- Students will engage course content effectively through the use of well-designed oral communication activities.
- Students will understand and be able to explain the conventions and expectations of oral communication as practiced within the discipline of the course taken.
- Students will understand and be able to identify basic theories and principles of oral communication.
- Students will apply theories and strategies for crafting messages (verbal, nonverbal, and visual) for particular audiences and purposes.
- Students will critically evaluate mediated and face-to-face communication.
- Students will communicate effective oral messages in a variety of settings, including public speaking, group discussion, and interpersonal communication.
- Students will plan, research, organize, support, and deliver ideas and arguments orally.
- Students will utilize a variety of research techniques, including web-based search and information retrieval resources, to synthesize information and support their messages.
- Students will understand and be able to explain the differences between varying modes of delivery such as memorized, manuscript, extemporaneous and impromptu speaking.
- Students will be able to craft oral messages after a conscious process in which various options are reviewed and will be able to explain and support their choices.
- Students will have an increased appreciation for the importance of oral communication competence as a component of personal, educational, and career goals.
- Students will be able to metacommunicate about their own communication patterns and how those patterns affect the various social roles they play.
New Online or Blended Course Proposal Form

For use in proposing a course for online delivery or for proposing to teach online when the online course was previously vetted for another instructor.

“UMW, with its long tradition of individualized attention to students, values its legacy of providing an exceptional undergraduate liberal arts experience and its growing reputation for offering high quality graduate and professional study.”

“The University will emphasize high quality teaching and intellectual inquiry, seeking to engage students, colleagues, and communities beyond the campus through opportunities for critical reflection, research, and practices that support and encourage learning.”

The Distance and Blended Learning Committee affirms these two statements from the University’s Strategic Plan (Sections V and VI) and believes they apply to all UMW courses, both traditional face-to-face and online.

The purpose of this New Online or Blended Course Proposal Form is to insure that our online courses meet these goals. To that end, each course should incorporate the five liberal arts & sciences values of community, interactivity, active learning, reflection, and self-directed learning. As you complete this proposal, you should highlight how each of these values is reflected in your course design.

The Appendix following this application explains these values in more detail and provides suggestions about how they might be incorporated in a course with majority online context. “Majority online format” includes blended and online courses in which 50% or more of the traditional seat time is replaced by online learning.

Submission Deadlines:
Online courses to be offered in the Spring semester must be accepted by the UFC no later than their October meeting. Therefore, the deadline for submitting an online course proposal to the Distance and Blended Learning Committee is September 1. Similarly, for Summer courses, the deadline is November 1, and for Fall courses, January 15.

Please submit your proposal (pp.2-3 of this document) to the Chair of the Distance & Blended Learning Committee before the deadline indicated above.
Part I: General Course Information

Department/Discipline & College: ____________________________________________

Course number & title: _____________________________________________________

Proposer’s name (Printed): _________________________________________________

Proposer’s signature: ______________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________

Semester to be first offered: ________________________________________________

Please indicate the duration of the course (e.g. 8 weeks, 14 weeks, etc.): __________

I agree with the reasoning provided below and support this course being offered online:

   CAS or COE Department Chair’s signature: _________________________________

or

   COB Associate Dean’s signature: _________________________________________

Please respond to the following questions:

1. Is this a new course or a blended/online version of an existing UMW course? (A new course should be approved by the University Curriculum Committee before being submitted here for online delivery.)

2. Are you a new instructor for this course? That is, if the course has already been approved for teaching online by some other faculty member, is this the first time you will be teaching this course?

3. Teaching online requires different skills than teaching face-to-face. Please describe your qualifications to teach this course in an online format. For example, have you completed the UMW training to teach online (to be offered beginning Summer 2012)? Have you completed some other training to teach online? Do you have past experience teaching online or taking online courses? How have you used technology in your traditional courses that is applicable to online teaching?

4. In what ways will offering this course online support the academic program of your Department and College?
**Part II: Course Design and Teaching**

1. Please provide a brief description of the course, for example, the course description as it appears in the UMW Course Catalog.

2. Please attach a current copy of the Course Syllabus.

3. What are the learning objectives of the course? Make sure the learning objectives align with the course description above.

4. Please describe how the learning outcomes (both formative and summative) will be assessed.

5. Briefly describe the online environment that you imagine for the class. Please identify the instructional resources, tools, technologies, and online Web spaces that you plan to use and briefly explain how you plan to use them. Through what means do you expect to offer students guidance with the technology you will use in this online environment?

6. List any training that you will need to effectively teach this course online.

7. Describe how your course will incorporate the values of a liberal arts curriculum: community, interactivity, active learning, reflection, and self-directed learning – See Appendix A for examples. In what ways will incorporation of these values help achieve the learning objectives you identified above?

Final Note: The Distance & Blended Learning Committee and the Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies are available to help develop your online or blended course proposal. Feel free to consult with either group.
Online or Blended Course Proposal Appendix

Value 1: Community

About This Value:

Within a liberal arts institution, we believe that learning needs to occur as a social activity and that students should develop a strong sense of belonging to a networked learning community. Learning communities serve many important purposes: They support and sustain the work of individual learners; they help to frame the work of individuals within larger intellectual conversations; and they offer the possibility of building something greater through collaboration.

About This Value in Online Learning:

Learning online necessarily involves students working with greater independence than they would in a face-to-face class. It's important that an online class not let “independence” turn into “isolation.” Online courses should not feel to students like they are participating in a correspondence course. As the instructor, one of your tasks is to determine how you will create opportunities for community-building and build online environments that sustain these communities.

Some approaches you might consider:

- Communities are built through the sharing of ideas and experiences. Online environments offer rich opportunities for students to share their work and provide feedback to one another. Consider requiring students to offer peer feedback on work they have publicly shared as a way to foster a learning community in your class.
- Online courses exist within the larger ecosystem of the open web, which is inhabited by all types of learners and thinkers. Consider inviting colleagues at other institutions (and possibly their students) to participate in the conversations developing in your course.
- As you build activities into your course that are aimed at developing student-student and student-instructor communication, consider having these conversations in the open, where students and faculty can benefit from shared insights, experiences, critiques, and questions.
- If your course involves a great deal of open community-building, consider taking time to discuss or offer advice about how to constructively critique each other’s work. As the instructor, it is also important for you to model these techniques.
Value 2: Interactivity

About This Value:

One of the signal characteristics of the quality learning experience is small class size, but what really matters to student learning is not the class size per se, but what the small class size enables: a high degree of interaction between student and instructor, as well as between the student and other students. Sometimes characterized as “high-touch,” this interaction leads to highly personalized instruction, where students are treated as individuals rather than part of a collective who sink or swim largely on their own efforts.

About This Value in Online Learning:

Traditional online courses have sometimes been little more than correspondence courses with little or no interaction. In our view, instructors should create opportunities for regular interaction with students and between students. There are a plethora of online options available for group activities and other interactions from discussion boards, to chat rooms, to blogs, wikis and google docs.

Some approaches you might consider:

- Offer regular and timely feedback on all student work submitted. Also, don’t rely on yourself to provide the only feedback in the course. Encourage (or require) students to provide feedback to each other; invite colleagues or students in other classes to occasionally drop in and offer feedback, advice, and support.
- Establish online office hours, i.e. regular time slots when you are available to discuss questions with students by telephone, Skype, or chat.
- Create informal opportunities for your students (with or without you) to convene virtually to talk about the class and their work. They could use Skype’s group chat capability or a streaming audio/video service that allows for multiple participants. If you’ve opened your class up to outside voices, you may want to invite those individuals to occasionally drop by. If you’re concerned about students not taking “ownership” of these experiences, you might assign a leader (or two) each time to choose a discussion topic, lead the discussion, invite outside participants, etc.
- Seek leadership roles for your students in the class that will allow them to build opportunities for interaction. These roles could rotate on a regular basis, allowing everyone a chance to “lead” an interactive conversation at some point. The point here is that if your students feel personally vested in the conversations that are emerging and how they are occurring, they’ll be more likely to take them seriously.
- Poll your students at the start of the term about how they prefer to interact online (via chat, Skype, Facebook, etc.). Work with your students to see if there is a way to incorporate these preferences into the class.
Value 3: Active Learning

About This Value:

Another characteristic of quality education is an emphasis on active, rather than passive pedagogy, including intensive use of writing and speech, as both tools of analysis and also communication. Active learning pedagogies lead to a focus on critical thinking rather than merely memorization. Another example is activities that engender genuine inquiry by students into real issues/problems, problems that matter to people outside the classroom, as well as exploring and being challenged by diverse perspectives.

About This Value in Online Learning:

It’s important that this course not be primarily about disseminating content to the students for them to absorb, but rather about engaging students in intellectual inquiry. Writing is easily conducted in online environments, as is online (asynchronous) “discussion.” New media can also be fairly easily created and then distributed via online mechanisms. In addition, online courses take place within the broader ecosystem of the Web that is filled with spaces and opportunities for exploring, sharing, and collaborating around ideas.

Some approaches you might consider:

1. Make use of online collaboration tools to build group assignments. For example, students can collaborate on building presentations (using Google Docs or Prezi), writing (with wikis or Google Docs), and making mind maps (with a tool like Creately). Build assignments in these spaces that focus on the development and sharing of new ideas as opposed to “reporting” back what they have read or found.

2. Use electronic discussion tools to build spaces for ongoing conversations. The discussion board in Canvas can be used for a fairly traditional asynchronous conversation. Other tools that might be considered are Voice Thread (which allows people to respond to images or other media using audio recordings), Google Moderator (which allows people to suggest questions/ideas, respond to them, and then “vote” on them) and Squabbler (which lets people record 30 second videos about an argument and then invite someone to take a counter position and record their response).

3. Consider an assignment you have asked students to do in paper/research format and consider how the citations, sophistication, and points can be conveyed in digital audio and/or video format.

4. Take time to think about some of the alternative assignments you might want to do and use DTLT to help train and prepare students for creating in audio/video etc.
Value 4: Reflection

About This Value:

Part of the justification for the study of humanities in liberal education is that such study addresses the human yearning for meaning. Such reflection is not limited, though, to the humanities. “What does it mean?” is an important means of transforming learning in the natural and social sciences from passive to active, from memorization to deeper understanding.

About This Value in Online Learning:

Not only do Web-based spaces allow for students to easily author and publish their reflections, they can use new media to convey their ideas. Moreover, unlike traditional journals, blogs can be opened to the world, enabling the author to obtain feedback from others both inside and outside the course.

Some approaches you might consider:

- Consider a course requirement that involves regularly blogging or producing some other kind of reflective content online.
- Encourage students to reflect on their work in your course through non-traditional media (for example, short audio or video reflections.)
- Remember to model this behavior yourself. Take time to regularly share your own reflections on the course and the discussion emerging from it.
- Design assignments that encourage reflection on the work they are doing in the course.

Value 5: Self-Directed Learning

About this Value:

The successful learner is expected to take ownership for her learning experiences. While faculty play a critical role in framing, guiding, and, sometimes, directing the path of these experiences, ultimately the learner must be able to rely on herself to make intellectual choices. These skills lay the foundation for life-long, adaptive learning as well as cultivating intellectual curiosity, creativity, flexibility, and self-discipline.

About This Value in Online Learning:

Through online interactions, it is possible for today's learner to frame out an intellectual identity for herself. The Web is less and less about consuming content and more and more about creating content, sharing ideas, and making connections. As the instructor, your task is to build opportunities in your course for students to use the Web as a platform for expressing and exploring their educational experiences.
Some approaches you might consider:

- Online learning differs enough from traditional teaching in enough ways that it is worth your time to be extremely explicit with your students about your expectations with regards to independent learning. Consider starting your class with a clear message to all of your students about what the online experience is likely to be like and how you recommend they approach their own learning experience.
- If your class involves students creating and managing their own Web spaces, consider requiring them to set out a “plan” for their activity in the class and then regularly update their progress on the site.
- As a way of fostering independence, you might let students choose how to fulfill certain assignments, particularly if there are multiple ways of addressing the goals of the assignment (through the use of different media, for example.)
- If your class involves a large group or even individual capstone projects, you could ask your students to draw up a “contract” with you in which they outline their goals, the tools and approaches they’ll be using, and their milestones. Use your course’s online space(s) to track student progress and goals.
- Regularly meet with students (via Skype, Gchat, etc.) over the course of the semester to discuss their work and progress. Make it moment where they take ownership of their own work and progress.